

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

☐ Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

☐ Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

☐ Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

☐ Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

☐ Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

☒ Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

☐ Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

☒ Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

☐ Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

☐ Pages detached/
Pages détachées

☐ Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

☒ Showthrough/
Transparence

☐ Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

☐ Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

☐ Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

☐ Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

☐ Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distortion le long de la marge intérieure

☐ Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

☐ Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

☐ Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

☐ Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

☐ Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

☐ Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



Library of the National
Archives of Canada

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol ➡ (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ▼ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:


La bibliothèque des Archives
nationales du Canada

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.



Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole ➡ signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ▼ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.




MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART

(ANSI and ISO TEST CHART No. 2)



APPLIED IMAGE Inc

1653 East Main Street
Rochester, New York 14609 USA
(716) 482 - 0300 - Phone
(716) 206 - 5909 - Fax



TARIFF REDUCTION

BY

THE LIBERALS



Free Wheat

Free Agricultural Implements

Free Wheat Products

Free Potatoes

Free Food

PUBLICATION NO. 54

1917

PAAP
JL
197.15
C4P8
no. 54

TARIFF REVISION

A complete revision of the Customs Tariff effected by the Liberals in 1897 was a great measure of reform which operated most beneficially to the people as was evidenced by the great development which took place in all spheres of activity and the great prosperity which became increasingly manifest for many years.

The Liberal Tariff was the first serious attempt made in Canada towards equality of treatment and reconciliation of conflicting interests. No class or interest was singled out for undue favoritism. The needs of all were considered. Herein lies the difference between the Conservative and Liberal attitudes on the tariff. The formula of the Conservatives for tariff making always has been the simple one of giving protection to the manufacturer without reference to the rest of the community. **The Liberals on the other hand believe in being fair all round and in distributing the burdens of taxation as much as possible. Consider the situation for a moment.**

OUR NATIONAL HEALTH

We have five great sources of national wealth. The farm, forest, fisheries, mines and manufacturing industries, on the income of which we keep our national house. It will be obvious that the interest and needs of these various producing branches are not identical. They conflict in some instances very strongly. The farmer for instances has to pay higher prices for his articles of necessity and comfort by reason of customs duties imposed thereon, whereas the prices for his produce are largely determined in the markets of the world. The miner, too, could buy most of his supplies and machinery cheaper if they were free from duty. The fishermen, who are chiefly located in the Provinces forming the extreme boundaries of the Dominion, are unable to supply the markets in our principal centres of population by reason of the great distance separating them therefrom, and are consequently obliged to export the bulk of their catch to foreign markets easier to reach, but where they have to encounter stiff competition. The lumberman also is affected by the tariff on his commodities. Manufacturing industries are an immense benefit to the country but not more so than the agricultural industries. Indeed, if we take the population engaged and the capital invested in farming and ranching, the agricultural interests bulk greater in the national wealth. Everybody recognizes that manufacturing institutions are necessary to build up a great nation and acknowledges that it would be undesirable to devote our attention purely to pastoral pursuits. Most people admit, too, that a certain measure of State assistance to manufacturing is necessary. The question is largely one of degree.

Briefly stated the new tariff:

1. Materially reduced the duties on many necessities and staple commodities used by consumers generally.
2. Placed on the free list certain articles of prime necessity to the farmer, the miner, fisherman and manufacturer.
3. Reduced the duties on iron and steel which constitutes the staple raw materials for many industries: duties on other raw materials were also lowered.
4. Simplified the classification of articles for duty purposes and thereby assured more uniform administration.
5. Last but by no means least, gave a substantial preference to the products and manufactures of Great Britain over the rest of the world.

EXTEND REDUCTION OF TAXATION

The extent of the reduction in taxation brought about by the tariff can be best arrived at by taking the average rate of customs duty imposed by the Conservatives during the last years they were in office and applying it to the imports, under the Liberal rule. In 1896, which was the last year of Conservative administration, \$18.28 was on the average collected on every \$100 worth of goods imported into the country. If the same rate had been collected during the time the Liberals were in office, instead of collecting duty to the amount of \$605,000,000 they would have collected \$685,000,000, so that there was an actual reduction of \$80,000,000 in fifteen years. This at the rate of about \$5,500,000 per annum. In addition to this saving one has to consider the reduced price of Canadian manufactures to the consumer by reason of the reduction in protection, because undoubtedly as a general rule, although not in every case, the selling prices of Canadian manufacturers are based upon the amount of protection they enjoy.

Again there is the indirect saving to the people in reduced prices on foreign exports to Canada by reason of the operation of a British Preferential tariff. The United States exporters to Canada for instance, had to reduce their price to Canadian buyers to off-set the reduction in duties in favour of British goods. This is an undoubted fact which we will elaborate later on.

Another way of arriving at the extent of the reduction in taxation brought about by the Liberal Government is to take the average rate of duty imposed by Conservatives during the eighteen years they were in office which was \$19.10 on every \$100 worth of goods imported into the country. If the same rate had been applied to the imports during the fifteen years from 1896 to 1911, the additional taxation which would have been imposed would have amounted to \$110,000,000 so that there was a saving to that extent to the people of the country.

BRITISH PREFERENCE

Perhaps the most outstanding feature of the new tariff was the adoption of a preference in favour of British goods, and it was probably the most popular step ever taken by any Government

in Canada. Judged by results, which we shall shortly specify, it has been highly beneficial alike to Canada, Great Britain and the Empire. This preference at first consisted of a reduction of 1-8 from the general tariff rates. A year or so afterwards the reduction was increased from 1-8 to 1-4 and later to 1-3. Subsequently the flat reduction of 1-3 was abandoned and a specific preferential rate provided for each item or article in the tariff. Such specific rate however on the whole averages a reduction of 1-3. The benefits of the preference were given not only to Great Britain but by successive steps to nearly all the British colonies.

Consider the practical results. Under the Conservative Administration British imports into Canada steadily declined as will be seen from the following figures :

1873.....	\$ 68,522,776
1883.....	52,052,465
1893.....	43,148,413
1897.....	29,412,188

At the rate the trade was declining the vanishing point was evidently in sight, and obviously something had to be done to ensure more purchases from the Motherland, our best customer for our natural products. In contradistinction to the decline in imports from Great Britain our sales to her had steadily increased thus :

1873.....	\$ 38,743,848
1883.....	47,145,217
1893.....	64,080,493
1897.....	77,222,502

It was readily apparent even to a casual observer that on equal terms in tariff matters the United States would shortly capture most of the trade which Britain had with Canada. Contiguity of market which facilitates buying, selling and transportation, coupled with similarity in habits, tastes, fashions, modes of living and methods of manufacturing undoubtedly gave the United States a great natural advantage in our markets as against the Motherland.

The preference granted by the Liberal Government was exactly the tonic that was necessary to stimulate British trade. From the moment it became law the trade started to boom and it has steadily and rapidly increased ever since, as the following figures prove :

1897.....	\$ 29,412,188
(last year prior to abolition of preference)	
1903.....	\$ 58,996,901
1908.....	94,959,471
1911.....	109,936,462
1913.....	138,761,568

We think it can be fairly argued from the foregoing facts that if the preference had not been granted in favour of British goods it is not at all likely that British trade would have assumed anything like the proportions shown by these figures. On the other hand the strong probability is that it would have kept on declining or at the best made slight progress.

But the increase in British imports was not the only beneficial result. The preference substantially reduced duties to the Canadian consumer on the most important staple commodities, and thereby implemented the pledge of the Liberal party to reduce taxation.

The Following is a Comparison of the Rates of Duty Under the Conservative Tariff of 1896, and Under the Liberal Tariff, on Certain Well-Known Articles.

ARTICLE	Conservative Tariff.	Liberal Tariff.		
		British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
Indian Corn.....	7½c. per bus.	Free	Free	Free
Rape Seed, sowing.....	10%.....	Free	Free	Free
Seed Beans from Great Britain.....	15c. per bus.	Free	Free	Free
Binder Twine.....	12½%.....	Free	Free	Free
Cordage.....	1¼c. per lb. and 10%, equivalent to from 28 to 35%.....	20%	22½%	25%
Books on the application of Science to Industries of all kinds.....	6c. per lb.....	Free	Free	Free
Books for the use of Mechanics' Institutes, Libraries of Universities, Colleges or Schools.....	6c. per lb.....	Free	Free	Free
Cream Separators.....	27½%.....	Free	Free	Free
Barbed Fencing Wire of iron or steel.....	¾c. per lb.....	Free	Free	Free
Galvanized Wire, iron or steel, 9, 12 and 13 gauge.....	25%.....	Free	Free	Free
Wire fencing, woven wire fencing of iron or steel.....	27½%.....	10%	12½%	15%
Wire of all kinds, n.o.p.....	25%.....	15%	17½%	20%
Ferment Cultures for Butter-making.....	Rates varying from 20% upwards.....	Free	Free	Free

The Following is a Comparison of the Rates of Duty Under the Conservative Tariff of 1896, and Under the Liberal Tariff, on Certain Well-Known Articles.

ARTICLE	Conservative Tariff.		Liberal Tariff.		
			British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
Agricultural Implements.					
Farm, Road or Field Rollers.....	35%		15%	22½%	25%
Forks, pronged.....	35%		15%	20%	22½%
Hay Tedders.....	35%		15%	22½%	25%
Hay Loaders.....	35%		15%	22½%	25%
Potato Diggers.....	35%		15%	22½%	25%
Hoes.....	35%		15%	22½%	25%
Spades and Shovels.....	50c. per doz. and 25% to about 38%		15%	20%	22½%
Fanning Mills.....	35%		20%	30%	32½%
Grain Crushers.....	35%		15%	22½%	25%
Windmills.....	35%		15%	22½%	25%
Threshers and Separators.....	30%		12½%	17½%	20%
Fodder and Feed Cutters.....	35%		15%	17½%	20%
Mowing Machines, Harvesters and Reapers.....	35%		15%	22½%	25%
Stoves of all kinds.....	20%		12½%	17½%	17½%
Table Cutlery of all kinds.....	27½%		15%	22½%	25%
	32½%		20%	27½%	30%

Pumps.....	30%				
Locks.....	32½%				
Nails, wire of all kinds.....	1c. per lb.	15%	25%	27½%	
Butts and Hinges.....	32½%	15%	25%	27½%	
Sleighs.....	30%	15%	25%	27½%	
Coal, Bituminous.....	60c. per ton.	17½%	22½%	25%	
Coal Oil.....	6c. per gal.	35c. per ton	45c. per ton	53c. per ton	
Lubricating Oil, composed wholly or in part of Petroleum.....		1½c. per gal.	2½c. per gal.	2½c. per gal.	
Candles.....	30%	15%	22½%	25%	
Common and Colourless Window Glass.....	20%	7½%	12½%	15%	
Cotton Duck.....	25%	15%	17½%	20%	
Grey Cotton Fabrics.....	22½%	15%	22½%	25%	
Cotton Sheets.....	32½%	17½%	22½%	25%	
Cotton Shirts, costing more than \$3 per doz.....	\$1. per doz. and 25%, equivalent to 37% ad val.	If dyed, 25%	If dyed, 30%	If dyed, 32½%	
Cotton Sewing Thread.....	25%	If undyed, 17½%	If undyed, 22½%	If undyed, 25%	
Cotton Fabrics, undyed.....	25%	17½%	22½%	25%	
Socks and Stockings.....	10c. per doz. prs. and 35%	17½%	22½%	25%	
Blankets.....	5c. per lb. and 25%. Extra duty to 39%	25%	32½%	35%	
Woollen Socks and Stockings.....	10c. per doz. prs. and 35%	If wholly of pure wool, 22½%	30%	35%	
		If not of pure wool, 30%	35%	35%	
		25%	32½%	35%	

The Following is a Comparison of the Rates of Duty Under the Conservative Tariff of 1896, and Under the Liberal Tariff, on Certain Well-Known Articles.

ARTICLE	Conservative Tariff.	Liberal Tariff.		
		British Preferential Tariff.	Intermediate Tariff.	General Tariff.
Undershirts and Drawers.....	35%	22½%	30%	35%
Woollen Cloth.....	5c. per lb. and 25%. Equivalent to ad val. duties ranging from 39 to 60%.....	30%	35%	35%
Flannels, plain.....	5c. per lb. & 25%	22½%	30%	35%
Wheat Flour.....	75c. per bbl.....	40c. per bbl.	50c. per bbl.	60c. per bbl.
Rice, cleaned.....	1½c. per lb.....	50c. 100 lbs.	65c. 100 lbs.	75c. 100 lbs.
Oranges.....	Specific rates, equivalent to 15%.....	Free	Free	Free
Wall Paper.....	Average rate, about 39%.....	22½%	32½%	35%
Head Ropes for fishermen.....	1¼c. per lb. and 10%.....	Free	Free	Free
Refined Cotton Seed Oil, for canning fish..	20%.....	Free	Free	Free

Very many more items could be added to this list, but as it stands it conveys a fair idea of the character of the changes that have been made by the Liberal Government.

In the foregoing list no reference is made to articles used by manufacturers. A great many reductions were made in the duties on raw materials or semi-finished products used by manufacturers.

**WHAT DO THE LIBERAL PARTY STAND FOR REGARDING
FREE WHEAT, FREE AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS,
FREE POTATOES, Etc., Etc.**

REDUCE THE HIGH COST OF LIVING

One of the most absorbing questions to the public now is the high cost of living and the majority of people dwell upon especially the high cost of food in this connection.

The Liberal party went out of office in 1911 on an effort to reduce the duties on food through reciprocity with the United States. By the reciprocity agreement Canada was to have free entry into the United States for many food products and these same and other products were to be brought into Canada free from the United States, thus giving the Canadian consumer an opportunity where convenient or better for him to buy imported foods without the additional cost of the duty.

The people of Canada did not see fit to adopt that policy but since that time constant and great increases in the price of food has brought home to them the fact that the cost of food is important to every householder in the country, indeed to everyone who eats, as the boarder and frequenter of restaurants is suffering fully as much as the householder.

FREE FOOD

The Liberal party have on various occasions since 1911 in the House of Commons and outside of it, announced itself in favour of the removal of the duties, on all foods and on various kinds of foods in particular.

On November 26th, 1913, Sir Wilfrid Laurier addressed the Liberal Club Federation of Ontario at Hamilton and announced a policy of free food, free from customs duties. These are the words Sir Wilfrid used at that time :—

"The policy I give you at this moment, the policy I believe every patriot in Canada ought to support, and the policy I believe it to be the duty of the Government to immediately inaugurate, is a policy of absolutely free food — free from customs duties."

This general statement has been followed by specific motions in the House of Commons demanding that certain foods should be placed on the free list.

FREE WHEAT AND WHEAT PRODUCTS

On January 28th, 1914 Dr. Neely, liberal M. P. for Humbolt (Sask.) moved that :—

"The House regrets, in the gracious speech with which your Royal Highness has met Parliament, the said speech gives no indication of any intention on the part of your advisers to take any steps to secure free access to the markets of the United States for the wheat and wheat products of Canada, by removing the duty on wheat and wheat products coming into Canada from the United States."

The Conservative members in the House of Commons voted against this motion, while the Liberal members voted for it.

**FREE WHEAT — WHEAT PRODUCTS, AGRICULTURAL
IMPLEMENTS AND STEPS TO BE TAKEN TO
ALLEVIATE THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.**

On April 23rd, 1914, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved —

"That this House is of opinion that in view of the prevailing economic conditions of the country it is advisable to place wheat, wheat products, and agricultural implements on the free list; and that without doing injustice to any class, steps should be taken to alleviate the high cost of living by considerate removal of taxation."

The Conservative members in the House of Commons voted against this motion, the Liberals voted for it.

FREE POTATOES

On April 28th, 1914, Mr. Loggie moved : —

"That tariff item No. 83 be amended by adding thereto the following words :

"Provided, however, that potatoes dry, desicated or otherwise prepared, being the growth and production of the United States, shall be admitted free of duty when, and as soon as, the United States removes the embargo regulations now existing against like articles, the growth and production of Canada."

The Conservatives in the House of Commons refused to pass this motion the Liberals voting for it.

FREE WHEAT PRODUCTS AND POTATOES

On February 23rd, 1916, Mr. J. C. Turriff, M. P. for Assiniboia (Sask.) moved —

"That in the opinion of this House, in order to secure to the farmers and people of Canada the advantages of the American market for wheat products and potatoes, steps should be taken at once to put these articles on the free list in the Canadian tariff."

The Conservative majority in the House of Commons voted this motion down, the Liberals voting for it.

OTHER RESOLUTIONS

These are all specific declarations on the part of the Liberal party tending to free food to the people and thus to lower the cost of living. In addition to these specific resolutions on foods we have two which are cognate and which tend in the same direction, one moved by Mr. W. E. Knowles, M. P. for Moose Jaw, Sask. on March 11th, 1914, to remove the duties on agricultural implements and the other, a motion of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier on April 23rd, 1914, to place wheat and wheat products and agricultural implements on the free list, both of which were rejected by the Conservative members of Parliament.

BLAST FURNACE SLAG

There is also a motion by the late Hon H. R. Emmerson, moved on February 10th, 1914, stating :

"That under Article 372 of the Customs Tariff of Canada, 1907, blast furnace slag is on the free list, but that the Board of Customs, at a meeting held on the 9th day of September, A.D. 1913, improperly and illegally declared the same to be dutiable under tariff item 663 and in effect from the 9th of November, 1913, without such declaration being, as appears, approved by the Minister of Customs as required by Statute and that the Department of Customs is now subjecting the same to duty is violating the Statute to the great injustice and loss of the farming community."

Showing that here the Liberals objected to this high-handed proceeding on the part of the Customs Department and the removal of this impediment to the farmers which raises the cost of production on their food products. The price of agricultural implements being raised by the tariff also materially interferes with the cost of production of food products among the farmers of Canada and consequently tends to accentuate the high cost of living. We see thus that the Liberal party has deliberately and emphatically in general and in detail declared itself in favor of the removal of the impediments of duty on food products and thereby reducing the cost of production of food in Canada.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy in his motion of April 23rd, 1914, also confirmed that steps should be taken to alleviate the high cost of living by a straight removal of taxation.

Again on the 16th of March, 1915, Sir Wilfrid Laurier moved as follows :—

"That Mr. Speaker do not now leave the Chair, but that it be resolved :

"That this House is ready to provide for the exigencies of the present situation, and to vote all necessary ways and means to that end, but it regrets that in the measure under consideration duties are imposed which must be oppressive upon the people, whilst yielding little or no revenue; and that the said measure is particularly objectionable in the fact that instead of favouring, it is placing extra barriers against Great Britain's trade with Canada, at a moment when the Mother Country is under a war strain unparalleled in history."

Protesting thereby against the increased 5% duty which had been placed on articles coming to Canada from Great Britain. By reason of this increased duty, the duties on certain food products that come from Great Britain are increased and therefore the cost of importation of these articles increased.

On all these occasions the Conservative party through the Government and its representatives in the House voted straight against this alleviation to the people of Canada in regard to the high cost of living. Here is a direct antagonism between two parties, the one in favour of relief to the whole people and the country; the other insisting upon the maintenance of obstacles in the way of commerce and supply of these essential articles. Is there no difference between the two parties? Is it of no concern to the average citizen who prides himself on not being a politician and plumes himself on taking no interest or part in public affairs which party should control the administration of the country? There are many other glaring and specific differences between the two parties, but we will content ourselves for the moment in emphasizing this.

Additional copies of this or any of the following pamphlets may be secured by applying to the Secretary of the Central Liberal Information Office, Ottawa.

War Scandals, (Second Edition). Revised and brought up to date.

An Administration of Extravagance in Patronage.

Shell and Fuse Scandals.

High Cost of Living.

Sir Sam. Hughes' letters to the Premier.

The Inside Story of the Conservative-Nationalist Alliance, (Second Edition).

The Finances of Canada.

ALL OF THESE PAMPHLETS HAVE RECENTLY BEEN ISSUED

ISSUED FROM THE
CENTRAL LIBERAL INFORMATION OFFICE
OTTAWA, CANADA

Subscribe to be Canadian Liberal Monthly, Ottawa, the Official publication of the Canadian Liberal Party. Price: 25cts a year.

of
ne
on
e,
is
it
e,
n

d
l.
s
e
e
t
e
o
e
n

